
USEPA Great Lakes National Program Office

FY2004-2005 Funding Guidance

CONTENTS

Overview

I. Funding Opportunity Description	1
A. Contaminated Sediments	1
B. Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction	3
C. Habitat (Ecological) Protection and Restoration, including Habitat Conferences	6
D. Invasive Species	10
E. Strategic or Emerging Issues .	11
F. Other LaMP/RAP Priorities .	13
II. Award Information	18
III. Eligibility and Matching	19
IV. Application and Submission	19
V. Application Review	23
VI. Award Administration	25
VII. Agency Contacts	26
VIII. Other Information	26

Overview

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) is requesting Initial Proposals for projects, collectively totaling up to \$4,180,000, furthering protection and clean up of the Great Lakes ecosystem. Projects should address Contaminated Sediments, Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction, Habitat (Ecological) Protection and Restoration, Invasive Species, Strategic or Emerging Issues, and Other Lakewide Management Plan or Remedial Action Plan (LaMP/RAP) Priorities.

This is the initial announcement of this funding opportunity for the Great Lakes Program under Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 66.469.

The deadline for all Initial Proposals is **8:00 AM Central time, Monday morning, March 29, 2004.**

Applicants should submit Initial Proposals using the PSS2004 software available from <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/2004guid/>. We request that you go to this website and register with us now, so that we can keep you informed about our funding process.

I. Funding Opportunity Description.

With this FY2004-2005 Funding Guidance, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA's) Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) is requesting Initial Proposals for Great Lakes projects addressing the following topics: Contaminated Sediments, Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction, Habitat (Ecological) Protection and Restoration, Invasive Species, Strategic or Emerging Issues, and Other Lakewide Management Plan or Remedial Action Plan (LaMP/RAP) Priorities. Although projects of "particular interest" will receive special consideration in evaluations, any Initial Proposal meeting the applicable criteria will be considered and may be selected. Applicants seeking more funding under existing awards should apply through this process. Descriptions of each topic, priorities within the topics, projects of particular interest, targeted amounts, and criteria follow. Estimates of dollar amounts and numbers of projects are included as planning targets. The actual amounts and numbers may differ substantially as described in Section II - Award Information. Amounts, Targets, and Number of Projects.

A. Contaminated Sediments - \$1,100,000 targeted for 5 to 12 projects. GLNPO requests Initial Proposals for funding, technical support, and vessel support to assist contaminated sediment work in priority geographic areas in the Great Lakes¹. GLNPO's emphasis and ultimate objective is to assist in bringing about remediation of contaminated sediments at these sites. GLNPO will not fund basic research focusing on the development of technologies for treating contaminated sediments.

Projects of Particular Interest. We are particularly interested in the following projects:

Top priority will be given to projects which will fill information or other gaps essential to achieving sediment remediation in the Areas of Concern (AOCs), pursuant to the Great Lakes Legacy Act, such as:

- ▶ sediment assessments to support the development of remedial alternatives.
- ▶ conduct evaluations of remedial alternatives for sites moving toward remediation.
- ▶ conduct source identification/source control projects.

¹Applicants should note that GLNPO is also issuing a separate Request for Projects addressing contaminated sediments in Areas of Concern pursuant to the Great Lakes Legacy Act. \$10 million or more may be available through the Legacy Act Request for Projects. Applicants may submit the same project to either the Funding Guidance process or the Request for Projects process, or both. Unlike this Funding Guidance, the Legacy Act Request for Projects: is intended for larger projects, is not a grant process, encourages substantial pre-application assistance, requires projects to be in Areas of Concern, and requires a 35% non-federal match. The Request for Projects will be available from www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/

A limited number of additional projects will be considered, if funding is available, including projects not at AOCs. These additional projects should include an education outreach component and include:

- ▶ sediment assessments [chemical (including Great Lakes Binational Toxics Strategy priority pollutants), physical, biological] to better map contamination at a site.
- ▶ those which determine economic benefits of conducting sediment remediation.
- ▶ data collection projects to support a review of the short-term and long-term effects of remedial alternatives on human health and the environment
- ▶ beneficial re-use of sediments, including associated human and ecological risk.
- ▶ monitoring/assessment projects focusing on post-remedial investigations.
- ▶ on the ground sediment remediation.
- ▶ demonstrations of innovative sediment treatment technologies and innovative sediment assessment techniques.
- ▶ those which lead to the setting of delisting targets for identified beneficial use impairments in AOCs related to contaminated sediment impacts.

Project Selection Criteria. Initial Proposals described in this request will be evaluated using the prioritization described above, the General Criteria, and the following Specific Criteria:

- ◇ Identification above as a particular interest.
- ◇ Availability and assessment of baseline conditions for remediation projects.
- ◇ Likelihood that remedial measures, including enforcement, will result.
- ◇ Public outreach component of activity.

Contact: Marc Tuchman (312-353-1369/ tuchman.marc@epa.gov)

B. Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction - \$500,000 targeted for 8-15 projects. GLNPO requests Initial Proposals for pollution prevention, reduction or elimination projects, with an emphasis on substances which are persistent and toxic, especially those which bioaccumulate, in the Great Lakes basin.

Projects of Particular Interest. We are particularly interested in the following projects:

- ▶ Source characterization: Assessment of potential sources of persistent toxic substances.
- ▶ Indicators of progress toward virtual elimination of persistent toxic substances.
- ▶ Proper disposal of persistent toxic substances.
- ▶ Foster adoption of innovative products that would reduce the use and release of persistent toxic substances and that are consistent with the principles of EPA's *Environmentally-Preferable Purchasing Program* (see <http://www.epa.gov/opptintr/epp>).
- ▶ Implementation of projects/actions delivering toxic reductions/pollution prevention in sectors targeted by the Great Lakes Binational Toxics Strategy (GLBTS²). Expected environmental outcomes must be quantified.
- ▶ Foster adoption of green technologies. In this context, green technology involves reducing or eliminating the use or generation of persistent toxic substances - including feedstocks, reagents, solvents, products and byproducts-during design, manufacture and use of chemical products and processes.
- ▶ Outreach to achieve source reductions from targeted sectors or groups, e.g., designing a campaign for educating the XX industry on ways to reduce usage and releases of YY chemical.
- ▶ Develop Great Lakes Basin-wide burn barrel outreach materials which target multiple user groups. Project should consider the best ways to disseminate materials to rural communities, in consultation with user organizations (e.g., LaMP Forums).
- ▶ Support for development of delisting targets for identified beneficial use impairments in AOCs related to fish and wildlife consumption, fish tumors or other deformities, and bird or animal deformities or reproductive problems.

The specific needs and priorities of Lakewide Management Plans and geographic initiatives such as the Remedial Action Plans for Areas of Concern will be considered in evaluations, particularly:

- *Lake Erie and St. Clair/Lake St. Clair/Detroit River basins.* Projects addressing the chemicals associated with the beneficial use impairments as identified by the Lake Erie LaMP (PCBs, mercury, PAHs, lead, chlordane, dioxins, DDE/DDT, mirex) with priority

²The GLBTS establishes reduction challenges for twelve "Level I" persistent toxic substances: alkyl-lead, benzo(a)pyrene [B(a)P], hexachlorobenzene (HCB), dioxins and furans, mercury, octachlorostyrene (OCS), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and five canceled pesticides (aldrin/dieldrin, chlordane, DDT, mirex, and toxaphene). The US has also identified "Level II" substances for pollution prevention activities: 1,2,3,4-tetrachlorobenzene; 1,2,4,5-tetrachlorobenzene; pentachlorobenzene; hexachlorobutadiene; and hexachlorocyclohexanes. See <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/bns/strategy.html>.

- given to projects (i) involving PCBs and mercury or (ii) which reduce the release of atrazine to the waters of Lake Erie, or (iii) encourage POTWs to coordinate, on a watershed basis, the development of Pollutant Minimization Programs, and activities to identify and reduce mercury loadings from various sectors.
- *Lake Ontario, St. Lawrence River and Niagara River basins.* Projects which:
 - (i) address pollutants identified in the 1998 Stage I Lake Ontario LaMP (PCBs, DDTs, mercury, mirex, dieldrin, and dioxins), and emerging toxics such as PBDE as well as projects along the Niagara River which address the priority toxics identified in the Niagara River Toxics Management Plan.
 - (ii) reduce mercury or other pollutants by building upon, or initiating projects similar in concept to auto mercury switch/ thermometer replacement; mercury collections from medical facilities; or electronic equipment collections;
 - (iii) reduce pesticides through clean sweeps;
 - (iv) demonstrate innovative technologies for control of pollutant loadings from the watershed; or
 - (v) encourage "Green Marinas."
 - *Lake Michigan Basin.* Innovative, demonstration projects which:
 - (i) demonstrate innovative technologies for control of pollutant loadings from a watershed assessment plan.
 - (ii) address dioxin and other pollutants formed from "burning trash in barrels."
 - (iii) further agricultural clean sweep efforts.
 - (iv) collect and/or phase out PCB and Mercury, including urban clean sweeps.
 - (v) prevent pollution from pesticides, including substitution or reduction projects, with priority given to atrazine.
 - (vii) incremental steps toward virtual elimination of PCB and mercury in lieu of a traditional TMDL for Lake Michigan.
 - *Lake Superior Basin.* Projects which characterize and reduce sources of Lake Superior critical pollutants in the Lake Superior Basin and otherwise address the main joint priorities of the Lake Superior Workgroup and the Lake Superior Forum. These include projects which:
 - (i) address the top mercury commitments of the LaMP, including workshops; education/outreach; abandoned white goods containing mercury and PCBs; and taconite mercury treatability.
 - (ii) address other LaMP mercury commitments such as mercury reduction of the main sources of environmental release in the Lake Superior basin: energy production (electric utility sector), taconite mining and ore processing, mercury releases at wastewater treatment facilities, and mercury releases from landfills, in order to meet the chemical load reduction schedules set in the Lake Superior Stage II LaMP document.

- (iii) enhance burn barrel outreach and education, especially in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.
 - (iv) otherwise address the chemicals identified as critical pollutants; PCBs, dioxins, DDT and metabolites, toxaphene, chlordane, aldrin/dieldrin, mercury, hexachlorobenzene and octachlorostyrene.
 - (v) address in-basin load estimates of mercury, dioxin and hexachlorobenzene that have a low degree of confidence but may represent a significant portion of the load from the Stage 2 and 3 inventories (e.g., small incinerators, treated wood or mercury products in the solid waste stream, and mercury release from landfills and solid waste transfer stations).
 - (vi) provide demonstration projects that significantly reduce non-point loadings of critical and other pollutants originating from the development of previously undeveloped land such as new parking lots and highway construction.
 - (vii) address the long-range transport of atmospheric pollutants to Lake Superior, especially those projects developed in conjunction with other international efforts - i.e., the United Nations Committee for Environmental Cooperation.
- *Lake Huron basin.* Priority pollutants for Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction efforts in Lake Huron include those causing beneficial use impairments in Areas of Concern -- especially PCBs, Chlordane, Dioxin, and Mercury -- but also including PAHs, heavy metals, and other compounds identified in the Saginaw River/Bay and St. Marys River RAPs. Initial Proposals are also requested that demonstrate innovative approaches to address the long-range transport of atmospheric pollutants to Lake Huron.

Project Selection Criteria. Initial Proposals described in this request will be evaluated using the General Criteria and the following Specific Criteria:

- ◇ Identification above as a particular interest.
- ◇ Includes an evaluation of the potential reductions of pollutants in the environment
- ◇ Jointly targets common goals under the Great Lakes Binational Toxics Strategy and the LaMPs.

Contacts: Ted Smith (312-353-6571 smith.edwin@epa.gov)

Further information: Please see <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/p2.html>

C. Habitat (Ecological) Protection and Restoration. GLNPO requests Initial Proposals for the two types of Habitat projects described below.

C.1. General Habitat (Ecological) Protection and Restoration. \$875,000 targeted for 8 to 18 projects. GLNPO requests Initial Proposals for projects that demonstrate practices and tools for protecting and restoring aquatic, terrestrial, and wetland ecosystems. Acquisition projects will not be considered. Basinwide projects having large-scale ecological implications for the Great Lakes ecosystem, and multi-organizational, binational partnerships are encouraged. Regional projects must be consistent with Lakewide Management Plan (LaMP) priorities described below, with Tribal priorities, or with regional ecological protection and restoration planning effort priorities. Local or site-specific projects must implement techniques that demonstrate protection and restoration measures or the need for standard protection and restoration techniques, and define expected outcomes.

Projects of Particular Interest. The following projects at the basinwide, regional, and local scales are of particular interest:

BASINWIDE:

- ▶ Organize a multi-organizational, binational partnership that proposes to begin protection and restoration activities on an ecosystem currently lacking overarching, strategic management. Components of the project could include species and ecological community inventories, conducting ecological assessments, building on State of the Lakes Ecosystem Conference (SOLEC) indicators, monitoring, or strategic planning. The Great Lakes Coastal Wetland Consortium (<http://www.glc.org/wetlands/>) and the International Alvar Initiative (<http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/ecopage/alvar/>) are two examples of existing GLNPO-funded multi-organizational partnerships. Examples of ecosystem types currently lacking overarching, strategic management are sand dunes, inland wetlands and nearshore aquatic habitats.
- ▶ Organize a multi-organizational, binational partnership to address habitat fragmentation as it relates to species and ecological community movement in response to climatic changes and/or land use pressures.

REGIONAL:

Lake Erie Basin

- a. Refine or develop indicators for species and habitats in Lake Erie and its AOC's.
- b. Support implementation of the draft Lake Erie LaMP Habitat strategy, available at http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/2004guid/lelamp_hab.pdf.
- c. Support protection and restoration of habitat in Lake Erie AOC's.

Lake Ontario, St. Lawrence River Basin, Niagara River Basin.

- a. **Assessment and Prioritization of Habitat Issues** - Up to \$50,000 targeted for 1 -2 projects

that will complement ongoing U.S. LaMP efforts to identify and prioritize significant habitat issues. These proposed projects should take maximum advantage of existing reports and studies with the aim of developing concrete proposals for specific actions. Initial Proposal development should include involvement of local and state governments

b. Assessing Feasibility of Dam Removals -Up to \$50,000 targeted for 1-2 projects. Develop feasibility study for the removal of a specific dams in New York State to allow upstream fish passage. Consideration of fish ladders or other means to mitigate impassable barriers may also be considered. Initial Proposals should have strong local government support and involve government environmental and natural resource agencies. The emphasis should be on project implementation. Projects should not require significant research such as assessment of upstream and downstream fish populations. The final project deliverable will provide an assessment of the impacts and benefits related to the removal of a dam as well as a detailed workplan and budget for the removal project. The Lake Ontario LaMP would work with local governments to locate implementation funding.

c. Mitigating Impacts of Lake-Level Controls - Up to \$50,000 targeted for 1-2 projects. Develop feasibility study to implement projects to mitigate the impacts that artificial lake level controls have had on New York State coastal wetlands. Initial Proposals would evaluate the use of weirs or other approaches to restore the functionality of coastal wetlands that have been altered due to the decreased range of water levels experienced since lake level controls were put in place. Initial Proposals should have strong local government support and involve government environmental and natural resource agencies. The emphasis should be on project implementation. The final project deliverable will provide an assessment of the impacts and benefits related to the mitigation project as well as a detailed workplan and budget. The Lake Ontario LaMP would work with local governments to locate implementation funding.

Lake Michigan Basin

- ◇ Development of a component leading to a watershed-wide biodiversity plan like the Chicago Wilderness plan.
- ◇ Implementation of a watershed biodiversity recovery plan.
- ◇ Identification of a protection plan for species reliant on ground and surface water.
- ◇ Activities to restore/protect wetlands and other nearshore preserves important to the health and spawning of Lake Michigan aquatic species.
- ◇ Protect and restore rare ecosystems (such as dunes, swales, and alvars).
- ◇ Providing GIS layer of lakewide habitat data and/or ground water/surface water exchange.

Lake Superior Basin

- ◇ Protect or restore stream/tributary habitat so as to produce a healthy tributary environment, including the restoration of both the land and water interface. Projects should be connected to a monitoring and evaluation project.
- ◇ Promote the achievement of Great Lakes Fishery Commission fish community objectives,

including the identification of critical habitat for key fish species which will allow development of quantitative goals for self-sustaining fish stocks; and the development of a standardized monitoring program to evaluate the status of the pelagic fish community of Lake Superior.

- ◇ Implement multi-jurisdictional restoration or protection watershed or forest stewardship management plan recommendations.
- ◇ Restore lost or degraded ecological components or processes in Lake Superior forest communities.
- ◇ Protect or restore rare ecological communities (i.e., pine barrens).
- ◇ Establish representative, protected baseline areas (Research Natural Areas) of the ecosystems around the Basin.

Lake Huron Basin

- ◇ On-the-ground efforts to restore natural tributary flows and increase available fish spawning habitat.
- ◇ Strategic, watershed-scale approaches to the quantification and prioritization of coastal wetland management and protection activities in Saginaw Bay, consistent with RAP delisting criteria.
- ◇ Assessment of off-shore reef habitat in Saginaw Bay and Tawas.

LOCAL:

- ◇ Implement techniques that demonstrate on-the-ground habitat protection or restoration in a particular locale.
- ◇ Show that habitat will actually be protected or restored at a particular site.
- ◇ Define the relationship of the project to regional protection and restoration efforts.
- ◇ Make an effort to include stakeholders in project planning or implementation.
- ◇ Strategically lead to AOC restoration, including assistance in setting delisting targets, for the following identified beneficial use impairments: degradation of fish and wildlife populations and loss of fish and wildlife habitat.

Project Selection Criteria. GLNPO's evaluation process will seek a balance among basinwide, regional, and local projects. Initial Proposals described in this request will be evaluated using the General Criteria and the following Specific Criteria:

- ◇ Identification above as a particular interest, either basinwide, regional, or local.
- ◇ Biological importance on a regional, basinwide or global scale.
- ◇ Project activities will test new techniques or approaches to ecological protection and restoration.
- ◇ Positive impact of the expected environmental results identified by the applicant.
- ◇ Effectiveness of education and outreach component.
- ◇ Potential for formation of new, multi-organizational, binational partnership(s).
- ◇ A significant number of acres of aquatic, riverine, wetland, and terrestrial habitat is protected or restoration efforts begun.

Contact: Karen Rodriguez, 312-353-2690, rodriguez.karen@epa.gov

C.2. Habitat (Ecological) Conferences and Printing. \$75,000 targeted for 15 to 25 projects. GLNPO requests Initial Proposals for conferences, workshops, meeting, and educational materials which address Great Lakes ecological protection and restoration issues, information, and/or actions.

Individual Project Amounts / Budget Period. Each Initial Proposal may be up to \$5,000 and should have a budget period of one year or less. Initial Proposals in excess of \$5,000 will be rejected.

Criteria. Initial Proposals described in this request will be evaluated using the General Criteria and the following Specific Criteria:

- ◇ Consistency of the theme with this request.
- ◇ The conference, workshop, meeting or production of educational material includes participants from as wide a variety of agencies and organizations as appropriate.
- ◇ Results of the conference, workshop, meeting, or the printed educational material, are to be made available to an appropriate audience in a timely manner.
- ◇ Potential to advance government and private partnerships and community involvement.

Contact: Karen Rodriguez, 312-353-2690, rodriguez.karen@epa.gov

D. Invasive Species - \$100,000 targeted for 2 to 4 projects. GLNPO requests Initial Proposals to address invasive (non-indigenous) aquatic and terrestrial species in the Great Lakes Basin with an emphasis on prevention.

Projects of Particular Interest. We are particularly interested in the following projects, with the highest priority given to the first two topic areas:

1. Development and demonstration of strong and innovative programs to prevent the introduction of new invasive species (aquatic or terrestrial) into the Great Lakes Basin.
2. Development and demonstration of strong and innovative programs to control the spread of invasive species within and from the Great Lakes Basin.
3. Documenting ecological impacts of invasive species on the Great Lakes Basin food web.
4. Documenting the economic impacts or potential economic impacts of invasive species already in the Great Lakes Basin.
5. Identification of chemical, physical, and biological conditions that promote the establishment of invasive species.
6. Development of innovative education/outreach projects.
7. Monitoring and followup on past exotic controls.

Project Selection Criteria. GLNPO's evaluation will consider priorities associated with invasive species for geographic areas within the Great Lakes, particularly those of Lakewide Management Plans; however, as funding for this category is limited, emphasis will be placed on projects of Great Lakes Basin-wide applicability. Education/Outreach projects are eligible. Initial Proposals described in this request will be evaluated using the prioritization described above, the General Criteria, and the following Specific Criteria:

- ◇ Identification above as a particular interest.
- ◇ Potential for project to benefit the Great Lakes ecosystem.
- ◇ Transferability across the Great Lakes Basin and beyond.
- ◇ Potential to advance government and private partnerships and community involvement.

Contact: Marc Tuchman (312-353-1369/ tuchman.marc@epa.gov)

E. Strategic or Emerging Issues - \$120,000 targeted for 4 to 8 projects. In order to better fulfill its mission under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement for the restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem, GLNPO is requesting innovative Great Lakes environmental projects which deal with strategic or emerging issues of basin-wide importance.

We expect that projects in this area would:

- not fit neatly under other existing GLNPO funding categories (i.e. Contaminated Sediments, Pollution Prevention, Ecological Protections and Restoration, Invasive Species, or the specific Initial Proposals requested for LaMP and RAP implementation) but might contain elements of one or more of those categories;
- address assessment, causes and/or effects of chemical or biological pollutants not in the regulatory “mainstream;”
- cut across or overlap two or more of the foregoing areas; or
- address some other unanticipated area.

Projects of Particular Interest. We especially encourage projects which identify and propose solutions/mitigation for strategic or emerging issues of Great Lakes Basin-wide applicability.

Areas of particular interest include:

- ▶ Chemicals of potential environmental concern such as polybrominated flame retardants, pharmaceuticals, and endocrine disruptors.
- ▶ Documentation and investigation of causes and effects of observed changes in components of the Great Lakes ecosystem (for example, population estimates, nutrient loads; changes in lower food web assemblages, including Mysis, Diporeia, benthos and plankton; and effects of these changes on the lake fisheries).
- ▶ Quantify and/or assess the connection between environmental contamination directly related to Great Lakes water quality and human health.
- ▶ Social and economic issues affecting Great Lakes management and environmental decision-making.
- ▶ Harnessing the innovation of market forces in environmental protection via air or water emissions trading.
- ▶ Conferences, workshops, and meetings whose theme addresses strategically important issues under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) and/or the 2002 Great Lakes Strategy.

Project Selection Criteria. Initial Proposals described in this request will be evaluated using the General Criteria and the following Specific Criteria:

- ◇ Identification above as a particular interest.
- ◇ Strategic importance and timeliness.
- ◇ Potential to further the restoration and maintenance of the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

- ◇ Potential to achieve progress under the Great Lakes Strategy.
- ◇ Transferability across the Great Lakes Basin and beyond.

Contacts: Paul Horvatin (312-353-3612/ horvatin.paul@epa.gov)/Michael Russ (312-886-4013/ russ.michael@epa.gov)

F. Other LaMP/RAP Priorities - \$795,000 targeted for 14 to 42 projects. USEPA has worked extensively with States, Tribes, and other partners in development and implementation of the Lakewide Management Plans and Remedial Action Plans. USEPA is now requesting Initial Proposals for projects which advance Lakewide Management Plan and Remedial Action Plan implementation and development.

The updated Lakewide Management Plans are available at:
<http://www.epa.gov/glmpo/gl2000/lamps/index.html>

Information about Remedial Action Plans is available from:
<http://www.epa.gov/glmpo/aoc/index.html>

Funding for some LaMP/RAP “program implementation awards for Great Lakes States” is not included in this Funding Guidance pursuant to a January 8, 2004 exemption from USEPA’s Competition Policy. USEPA will contact States separately to discuss assistance pursuant to this exemption.

Projects of Particular Interest. USEPA staff and LaMP and RAP partners have identified the following as projects of particular interest:

1. RAP Delisting Projects for the 31 US AOCs- \$30,000 targeted for 1-3 projects which will lead to the setting of delisting targets for identified beneficial use impairments and/or delisting of individual AOCs. This includes projects which will help AOCs to set delisting targets for the Beneficial Use Impairments that apply to their AOC, and/or fund work to develop delisting documents, or to develop "how to" procedures for setting targets for each of the 14 Beneficial Use Impairments.

Contact: Mark Elster (312-8863857 / elster.mark@epa.gov)

2. Lake Ontario Projects totaling up to \$850,000 for 6-21 projects, including: RAP Coordination; Contaminant Source Trackdown; Tributary Load Monitoring, Lake Ontario Mass Balance Model.

a. RAP Coordination/Management - Up to \$500,000 total targeted for 1-3 projects over 5 years. Lake Ontario RAP coordination and oversight of the following New York State RAPs: Buffalo River; 18 Mile Creek; and Rochester Embayment. Initial Proposals may address more than one RAP. The Initial Proposal should specify the work that would be done incrementally over a 5 year period for a budget of up to \$100,000 annually. The Initial Proposal should address the following tasks associated with the development and implementation of the RAP strategy(s), including:

- (1) Tracking and coordination activities, e.g.,
 - development of RAP quarterly updates and annual RAP status reports that describe and track remediation efforts aimed at eliminating beneficial use impairments

- identified for each RAP and moving the AOC towards delisting;
 - organization of quarterly meetings of the remedial advisory committees and distribution of meeting minutes to USEPA, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) and Remedial Action Committee participants;
 - coordination of RAP activities with other Great Lakes programs such as the Lake Ontario LaMP and the Niagara River Toxics Management Plan; and,
 - coordination of RAPs with related organizations such as the International Joint Commission (IJC) and USEPA/GLNPO; participation and co-operation with any IJC RAP assessments as necessary.
- (2) Undertake remediation and ecosystem restoration efforts aimed towards AOC delisting, including:
- coordinate and implement the remediation of environmental problems as identified in the RAP;
 - coordinate and implement ecosystem restoration efforts as identified in the RAP; and,
 - periodically re-evaluate beneficial use impairments and adjust remediation strategies and ecosystem restoration efforts as necessary for the elimination of impairments and AOC delisting.

b. Contaminant Source Trackdown

(1) Up to \$80,000 total targeted for 1-8 projects. Sampling related to the trackdown of contaminated sources in the Niagara River Basin. Recent biomonitoring data collected by NYSDEC (2002) and Ontario's MOE (2003) have indicated potential sources of contamination in selected tributaries/segments of the Niagara River. Initial Proposals are requested for further trackdown related sampling that can build on existing data and lead to contaminant source identification, trackdown and remediation, particularly on the following segments and contaminants:

- (a) Cayuga Creek (upstream sources of PCBs, organochlorine pesticides, dioxins/furans)
- (b) Bergholtz Creek (upstream sources of PCBs, dioxins/furans)
- (c) Gill Creek (upstream sources of PCBs, organochlorine pesticides, dioxins/furans)
- (d) Pettit Plume (sources of PCBs upstream)
- (e) Gratwick Riverside Park Potential (sources of PCBs upstream)
- (f) Little Niagara River near the 102nd Street Landfill (sources of dioxins/furans)
- (g) Black Rock Canal (sources of PCBs)
- (h) Little Niagara River above Cayuga Creek (sources of dioxins/furans)

(2) Up to \$60,000 total targeted for 1-4 projects. Data synthesis of previous multi-media tributary sampling and remediation efforts. Several tributaries of the Niagara River (e.g., Gill Creek, 2-Mile Creek, Scajaquada Creek) have been the subject of extensive remedial efforts, including the sediment, water, and biota sampling related to trackdown efforts;

remediation; and post-remediation evaluation. Initial Proposals are requested that would synthesize all available chemical, physical, and biological tributary data; summarize all remediation efforts; and develop spatial GIS maps that would identify pollutant hot spots; areas of past remediation; and previous sampling locations. Maps and data synthesis will be used to guide future trackdown-related sampling efforts.

c. Lake Ontario Mass Balance Model Up to \$60,000 for 1 project. Improve and evaluate modeling capabilities of LOTOX2. Initial Proposals are sought to compile, synthesize, and incorporate all recently-obtained priority pollutant data (atmospheric, water quality, sediment, and biota) into the Lake Ontario bioaccumulation model, LOTOX2, for the purposes of calibration confirmation, re-calibration and/or validating the model for each of the Lake Ontario priority pollutants. Following the re-calibration of LOTOX2, the proposers will then update the current documentation for LOTOX2 and subject the model, the model code, and the complete documentation to an outside peer review group of independent experts (selected by US EPA). Activities associated with the peer review process will include, but are not limited to: participation in a 2-day peer review workshop; providing written responses to all peer reviewer comments; and revising the model documentation, and model, as necessary to address peer-reviewer concerns.

d. Tributary Load Monitoring - Up to \$100,000 total targeted for 1-4 projects. To support the Lake Ontario mass balance model, information on tributary loadings from the Oswego, Genesee and Salmon Rivers and 18 Mile Creek is needed for 6 critical Lake Ontario pollutants (PCBs, Hg, dieldrin, DDT, mirex, dioxins/furans). Initial Proposals for monitoring should include:

- the development of monitoring plans;
- seasonal monitoring of Lake Ontario critical pollutants and tributary flows; and,
- the calculation of seasonal and annual loadings of Lake Ontario critical pollutants.

e. GLWQI Implementation - Up to \$50,000 for pilot projects that will develop or test new sampling, analytical or permit development approaches needed to fully achieve the goals of the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative (GLWQI) through New York State's State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) program. Project results should have broad applicability to other locales and geographic areas so as to support the implementation of new SPDES requirements statewide.

Note: Lake Ontario Projects for Assessment & Prioritization of Habitat Issues, Assessing Feasibility of Dam Removals, and Mitigating Impacts of Lake-Level Controls are included in the Habitat solicitation.

Contact: Barbara Belasco (212-637-3848 / belasco.barbara@epa.gov). The LaMP is at: <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/ontario.html>

3. Projects for Lakes Michigan, Erie, Superior, and Huron. \$530,000 targeted for 7-18 projects. The projects described below will have the highest priority, with others to be considered as funding is available.

a. LaMP/RAP Implementation through Facilitating Forum Stakeholders - 1-3 projects totaling up to \$245,000, including facilitation of multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral, citizen's groups or Fora that will undertake projects to implement LaMP commitments for Lakes Michigan, Erie, and/or Superior, and the RAPs within those Lake Basins. Binational LaMPs would require binational participation. The focus is on the implementation of high priority LaMP and RAP goals and commitments which will advance restoration of impaired beneficial uses. Projects should include public meetings held around the Basin for the express purpose of educating/ outreaching on specific issues of interest to the Lake stakeholder community and other outreach such as newsletters, web sites, and list serves.

b. Tribal LaMP and RAP Implementation. \$130,000 targeted for 1 to 5 projects. LaMP and RAP implementation and coordination on behalf of Tribal interests pertaining to Lakes Michigan and Superior and their associated RAPs, with emphasis on addressing LaMP and RAP commitments for reduction of critical pollutants, and implementing top habitat, terrestrial, and aquatics commitments of the LaMP and RAPs. Projects should include active Tribal technical coordinating committee representation and participation; updating of websites; tracking and updating of LaMP and RAP progress; RAP liaison work; and coordination of LaMP or RAP related monitoring. Planning targets are: \$20,000 for Lake Michigan and \$110,000 for Lake Superior.

c. Lake Michigan Monitoring Coordination - \$25,000 targeted for 1 project. Enhance and facilitate Lake Michigan monitoring coordination by Lake Michigan States by facilitating the Lake Michigan Monitoring Coordination Council.

d. Lake Michigan Environmental Education Boat Tour - \$15,000 targeted for 1 project. Enhance the public's environmental appreciation and awareness of Lake Michigan environmental issues and priorities identified in the LaMP and at the FY03 State of Lake Michigan Conference. In addition to other information necessary to address the General Criteria, the project should provide for a research vessel docking at up to 10 Ports in Areas of Concern and specify how the applicant will leverage this funding through its activities and partnerships with local AOC groups.

e. Lake Michigan RAP / Tributary Monitoring - \$60,000 total targeted for 1-6 projects. Local Monitoring projects at Lake Michigan tributary mouths would generate data points for a 10 year trend line for the Lake Michigan Mass Balance study and provide information needed for consideration of Area of Concern delisting. The project or projects must provide for coordinated, intensive one-year contaminant monitoring by

Lake Michigan States. The existing monitoring assessment is at <http://www.glc.org/monitoring/lakemich>

f. St. Louis River RAP Infrastructure. \$35,000 targeted for 1 infrastructure support to implement recommendations from the St. Louis River RAP, with a special emphasis on the impact of stormwater on local water quality and quantity.

g. Lake Superior Stewardship - \$20,000 targeted for a project to continue developing an education curriculum for high schools students on the stewardship of Lake Superior. Funding could be used to for further development of curriculum, development of educational software, and the development and implementation of an interactive website.

A limited number of additional projects will be considered, if funding is available, including:

- **Watershed Training and Implementation** - Recipient will utilize Lake Michigan Watershed Academy Training to facilitate or develop new “Academy” communities or Tribes for training or for implementing watershed plan components of the LaMP or RAP projects such as Burn Barrels, PCBs, Mercury Phaseouts, Tributary Buffers, or land use/habitat restoration. The Lake Michigan Watershed Academy training is modeled after general Watershed Academy training available from:

<http://www.epa.gov/owow/watershed/wacademy/>

- **Additional Lake Michigan RAP / Tributary Monitoring projects.** See above.

Contacts:

Lake Michigan: Judy Beck (312-353-3849 / beck.judy@epa.gov). The LaMP is at: <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/michigan.html>

Lake Superior: Elizabeth LaPlante (312-353-2694 / laplante.elizabeth@epa.gov). The LaMP is at: <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/lakesuperior/index.html>

Lake Huron: James Schardt (312-353-5085 / schardt.james@epa.gov). The Lake Huron Initiative is at: <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/huron.html>

Lake Erie: Daniel O’Riordan (312-886-7981 / oriordan.daniel@epa.gov). The LaMP is at: <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/erie.html>

Project Selection Criteria. GLNPO’s evaluation process for the “Other LaMP/RAP Priorities” category will seek a balance among projects at the Lake level and at the Area of Concern level, emphasizing projects which will have the greatest potential to remove beneficial use impairments over the next 1-5 years. Initial Proposals described in this request will be evaluated

using the General Criteria, and the following Specific Criteria with respect to each Lake and its Areas of Concern:

- ◇ Identification above as a particular interest.
- ◇ How well the project addresses priority environmental needs and priorities identified in the respective LaMP.
- ◇ How well the project addresses priority environmental needs and priorities identified in a Remedial Action Plan. RAP Projects should be within the identified boundaries of the AOC and will be favored if they have been identified in the RAPs as needed to remove Beneficial Use Impairments.
- ◇ Project consistency with LaMP, RAP, and/or Great Lakes Strategy timelines.
- ◇ Evidence of previous successful coordination and collaboration with other organizations involved with the LaMP or RAP.
- ◇ Evidence of community based support, including monetary contributions, steering committee resolutions, adoption of goals and objectives, etc.

II. Award Information

Pursuant to this Request, GLNPO is requesting applicants to submit Initial Proposals for 55 to 125 projects, collectively totaling up to \$4.18 million, furthering protection and clean up of the Great Lakes ecosystem.

Additional Funding for Existing Projects. Applicants requesting more money for existing GLNPO projects are generally expected to submit their proposals for additional funding as a part of this Funding Guidance process; however, GLNPO may approve a single non-competitive funding amendment of up to \$75,000 provided the amendment is for activities consistent with the original scope of work.

Amounts, Targets, and Number of Projects. Estimates of dollar amounts and numbers of projects are included as planning targets. The actual amounts and numbers may differ substantially for many reasons, including: EPA's operating plan has not been developed and portions of the resources being allocated for the Funding Guidance have not been specified by Congress; the number and quality of meritorious, technically qualified Initial Proposals is unknown; and EPA seeks a geographic balance among selected projects. EPA reserves the right to select all or none of the Initial Proposals tendered. Information about the number and amounts of awards for each funding area is included in Section I.

In FY 2003, GLNPO notified potential applicants that it was seeking proposals for a total of \$4.9 million in the priority areas of: Contaminated Sediments; Habitat Protection and Restoration; Pollution Prevention; Invasive Species; Emerging or Strategic Issues; LaMP/RAP priorities; and Conferences. In response, applicants submitted 340 proposals, seeking \$28.5 million in funding. Applicants were asked to submit application packages for 93 projects <<http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/2003fund/yeslist.html>> totaling \$4.9 million. USEPA has issued, or expects to issue, award documents for all of those projects. The "success rate" for proposals submitted in FY2003 was 27%, higher than success rates of recent years, which ranged from 14% in FY2000 to 25% in FY2002.

Anticipated Start and End Dates. Most projects begin in September or October; however, if an applicant is selected in May and immediately submits all required grants forms, it is possible that a project could begin as early as July. Except for incrementally awarded Lake Ontario projects in Section I.F.1.a., applicants should plan for projects to be completed within 2 years of their start dates. Applicants should also consider the Federal requirement that projects involving data collection require an *approved Quality Assurance Project Plan prior to commencing environmental data collection* - extra funds and extra time may be needed for its development.

Clarification/Revisions. Applicants may be contacted for clarification and for the purpose of negotiating changes in project terms and amounts.

Confidentiality. Applicants should clearly mark information they consider confidential, and EPA will make final confidentiality decisions in accordance with Agency regulations at 40 CFR. Part 2, Subpart B. However, we discourage submission of any confidential material. Note that under Public Law No. 105-277, data produced under an award is subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

Type of Award. Successful applicants could be issued a grant, cooperative agreement, inter-agency agreement or such other funding instrument as may be most appropriate.

III. Eligibility and Matching

Eligibility. Assistance is available pursuant to Clean Water Act §104(b)(3) for activities in the Great Lakes Basin and in support of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance identifies this assistance as: 66.469, Great Lakes Program. State pollution control agencies, interstate agencies, other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations are eligible; "for-profit" organizations are not. Preference is given to US organizations over foreign organizations; however, coordinated, binational projects are encouraged.

Ineligible Activities. Under this solicitation, USEPA will not fund: "construction grant" projects; basic research; land acquisition; or general operating support. Education/outreach or conferences are only eligible activities when integrated within a larger project or as specifically requested in the respective funding categories described in Section I.

Match. GLNPO has eliminated its requirement for a Non-Federal Match; however, matching funds (in cash or in-kind) are encouraged and the match percentage will be considered by reviewers during evaluations in the same way as other criteria are considered.

IV. Application and Submission

Getting Started. Register now at <<http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/2004guid/register.html>> so that we can update you on our funding process, including any changes to deadlines and the schedule for a proposed public conference call to discuss Funding Guidance questions. The 4 steps to submit an Initial Proposal are:

1. Get the free PSS2004 software
<<http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/2004guid/pss2004/index.html>>
2. Read and follow instructions.
3. Enter and edit your Initial Proposal submission.
4. Complete and submit your Initial Proposal.

Developing Initial Proposals. Initial Proposals should be developed using the GLNPO Proposal Submission System (PSS2004) available from:
<<http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/2004guid/pss2004/index.html>>. Please read the instructions for getting started and for using PSS2004.

Examples from Previous Years. When developing Initial Proposals, consider “model submissions” of successful proposals from previous years, available at
<http://www.epa.gov/grtlakes/fund/modelsubmis.html>

Format. PSS2004 generates the correct format. For your convenience, one-page “line-by line” instructions for the required components are included at the end of this section, allowing you to see our requirements, compose your work off line, then copy and paste it into the program. PSS2004 limits your Initial Proposal to about five pages.

Submission. Electronic submissions are required. Attach a copy of the data file, "APL2004.TPS," from the C:\PSS2004 subdirectory and e-mail it to: glnpo.funding@epa.gov. If sending a disk, include the “APL2004.TPS” file, and mail it to:

USEPA - GLNPO (G-17J)
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3590
Attention: Lawrence Brail

Technical Difficulties. We encourage you to call Tony Kizlauskas (312- 353-8773) or Pranas Prankevicius (312-353-3437) for technical assistance or if you do not have access to a PC. PSS2004 does not work on Macintosh computers.

Deadline. Initial Proposals are due by **8:00 AM Central time, Monday morning, March 29, 2004.** GLNPO will determine timeliness by reviewing the date and time of receipt by glnpo.funding@epa.gov or GLNPO’s front office, as applicable. However, APPLICANTS MUST CHECK THE INITIAL PROPOSAL POSTING at

<http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/glf.html> to verify our receipt. INITIAL PROPOSALS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN POSTED TO THIS LIST WITHIN TWO WEEKS OF THE DEADLINE SHALL BE DEEMED TO HAVE MISSED THE DEADLINE. Late applications will generally not be reviewed and considered, except under special circumstances approved by the GLNPO director.

Funding Restrictions: See Eligibility - Ineligible Activities.

Multiple Initial Proposals. If your organization submits multiple Initial Proposals and chooses to rank them, please use PSS2004 to identify an overall contact (including phone, e-mail, and address) and send a single, coordinated submittal. Ranking information could, instead, be sent by e-mail directly to brail.lawrence@epa.gov. Individuals from the following organizations have offered to serve as their organizations' contacts for submitting multiple Initial Proposals.

- Illinois EPA: Tammy Mitchell (217-524-2292)
- Indiana DEM: Alex da Silva (219-886-3734)
- Indiana DNR: Michael Molnar (317-233-0132)
- Michigan DEQ: Rick Hobrla (517-335-4173)
- Minnesota PCA: Pat Carey (218-723-4744)
- Minnesota DNR: Pat Collins (218-834-6612)
- New York State DEC: Donald Zelazny (716-851-7130)
- Ohio EPA: Julie Letterhos (614-644-2871)
- Pennsylvania DEP: Lori Boughton (814-332-6155)
- Wisconsin DNR: Kim Walz (608-264-9220)
- Army Corps of Engineers: Jan Miller (312-353-6354)
- Great Lakes Commission: Michael Donahue (734-971-9135)
- TNC: Lois Morrison (312-759-8017)

“Line-by-Line” Instructions for PSS2004 Data Entry
(Tabs refer to data entry in the Proposal Submission System)

APPLICANT INFORMATION (TAB1)

Applicant. Enter Applicant Organization Name, Contact Person's Title and Name, Business Address, City, State, Business Phone, Fax, and E-mail. For Phone and Fax numbers, enter the 10-digit number without punctuation or spaces.

Type of Organization. Choose one from a drop-down list including: State; Interstate Agency or Commission; Sub-state or special purpose district; County; Municipality; Federal Agency; College or University; Tribal Organization; Federally funded research and development center; or Other.

PROJECT SUMMARY INFORMATION (TAB 2)

Project Title. 60 character limit.

Abstract. One paragraph synopsis which can stand alone as a project description. (2,000 character limit)

Duration. Specify project duration, from 0.5 years up to 2 years (select from the spin-box list); however, Lake Ontario projects described in Section I.F.1.a may specify up to 5 years.

Category. Choose only 1 from a drop-down list. *Do not submit the same project to multiple categories.*

Rank Within Category. Optional. Can be used if multiple Initial Proposals are being submitted within the same project category from the same organization. To only be filled in after rank is assigned by the organization's coordinator.

GEOGRAPHIC APPLICABILITY (TAB 3)

Applicable State. Select Great Lakes State(s) which would be most impacted by this project. (Click on appropriate boxes).

Applicable Lake Basin. Identify Lake Basin(s) which would be most impacted by this project. (Click on appropriate boxes.)

Applicable Geographic Initiative. If applicable, identify geographic initiative which would be most impacted by this project. (Click on box for Greater Chicago, Northeast Ohio, NW Indiana, Southeast Michigan, or Lake St. Clair.)

Applicable Areas of Concern. Identify the Areas of Concern affected by the Project: Choose the primary affected Area of Concern from the drop-down list. List any others in the field entitled "Other Affected AOCs." (1,000 character limit)

Project Location. Enter applicable zip code with 4 digit zip code extension (available from <http://www.usps.com/zip4/>). As applicable, enter the City, County, or State(s). (50 character limit)

PROBLEM STATEMENT (TAB 4)

Problem Statement. Describe the issue that will be addressed and its relevance to the Great Lakes, particularly to needs and priorities in Great Lakes Strategy 2002, LaMPs and RAPs. (4,500 character limit)

Environmental Outcome. Describe anticipated environmental

outputs and outcomes, referencing affected pollutants, industry sectors, economic impacts, habitats, and/or species. Estimate chemicals to be “collected or prevented” for Contaminated Sediments and for Pollution Prevention and Toxics Reduction projects. State the number of acres of aquatic, wetland, riverine, and terrestrial Great Lakes habitat to be positively impacted for Habitat projects. (5,000 character limit)

Proposed Work. Outline what will be done and how. (11,000 character limit)

PROJECT MILESTONES (TAB 5)

Milestones. Specify up to 8 milestones and/or final products and projected due dates (MM/YYYY format), including Project Start and End. Projects selected in May could begin in July; however, most usually begin in September or October.

EJ/EDUCATION APPLICABILITY (TAB 6)

Environmental Justice. Check box and describe if the project addresses “Environmental Justice.” (2,000 character limit)

Education/Outreach Component. Check box, if the project includes an education/outreach component. If applicable, describe the target audience and how that group would be impacted by the project in the field entitled "Education/Outreach Description". (2000 character limit)

PROJECT BUDGET (TAB 7)

Budget. Fill in the applicable budget items in the table to show how USEPA funds and Applicant matching funds will be used for personnel/salaries, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contract costs, and other costs. You may include a separate line for indirect costs if your organization has in place (or will negotiate) an "indirect cost rate" from a cognizant Federal agency. Budget should represent the total which would be requested from USEPA for the project's duration. Funding will be awarded as a "lump sum" and is not assured for subsequent years. Do not include commas when entering the budget amounts. Totals will be calculated automatically or by pressing “calculate.”

OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING (TAB 8)

Other Funding. If others are expected to contribute funds to your Project, list the Name of the Providers, Amounts Provided, and Commitments made by each. (2,000 character limit)

COLLABORATION (TAB 9)

Collaboration/Community-based Support. Describe plans and status of collaboration amongst the public, private, and independent sectors. Evidence of support will be requested later.

V. Application Review

Criteria. Initial Proposals will be evaluated for conformity with the requests in Section II, applying the Specific Criteria there and the following General Criteria.

General Criteria. *Does the Initial Proposal: (i) State a Rationale/Relevance/Bias for Action? (ii) Have Scientific/Professional Merit? (iii) Demonstrate Innovation? (iv) Demonstrate Performance Capability? (v) Involve Diverse Stakeholders? (vi) Have the appropriate Geographic Scope? (vii) Disseminate Results effectively? (viii) Outline an Appropriate Budget? (ix) Leverage additional resources? (x) Most closely match GLNPO's mission, instead of that of Other Funding Sources? We especially welcome projects which address Environmental Justice and have community-based support. Applicants with a history of performance problems (such as delays in completing quality system documentation, delivering progress or final reports, or closeout documents) will receive less consideration than Applicants with a good performance record.*

Rationale/Relevance/Bias for Action: Funding will be directed to projects showing the most potential, whether direct or indirect, to protect and/or restore the Great Lakes Basin ecosystem, emphasizing the projects proposed in this Funding Guidance. Successful Initial Proposals will explain how they address issues most relevant to Great Lakes policymakers in a value-adding way or result in practical activities which promise measurable progress to protect and/or restore the Great Lakes Basin.

Scientific/Professional Merit: Soundness of approach is a key consideration, including design, objectives, and scientific viability of the project.

Innovation: We favor projects which do not duplicate prior efforts or which build upon prior efforts in value-adding ways.

Performance Capability: The experience and resources (including facilities, equipment, and instrumentation, if applicable) of applicants should be shown to be appropriate to perform the work proposed. Applicants with existing EPA projects should be up-to-date on reporting and other requirements.

Stakeholders: Plans to work with appropriate partners and customers, for instance government agencies, community groups, businesses, or stakeholders for Lakewide Management and Remedial Action Plans, will be considered.

Geographic Scope: Projects which aim to serve environmental needs identified by Lakewide Management and Remedial Action Plans will be considered on this basis. Support from LaMP and/or RAP committees will be considered.

Disseminate Results: Plans to disseminate project results will be considered. Broad public dissemination is favored.

Appropriate Budget: Applicants must suggest a budget reasonably in keeping with the level of work proposed and with expected benefits.

Leveraging. We favor projects which leverage additional resources from their own and other organizations. Leveraging will be considered holistically with other criteria.

Other Funding Sources: Projects for which funding could reasonably be expected from other sources will receive less consideration. Some NOAA, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Army Corps of Engineers, and Natural Resources Conservation Service and USEPA funding opportunities are described in the 2002 Great Lakes Roadmap to Federal Funding Opportunities at < <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/2002guid/Roadmap2002b.pdf> >.

Environmental Justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of Federal, State, local, and Tribal programs and policies.

Review and Selection Process. Evaluations take into account an Applicant's ranking of its Initial Proposals and do not penalize for submitting multiple Initial Proposals. Evaluations will take into account recommendations on specific needs and priorities of geographic areas within the Great Lakes, particularly those of Lakewide Management Plans or Initiatives for each of the Great Lakes and their included geographic initiatives such as the Remedial Action Plans for Areas of Concern. *In making award decisions, USEPA will consider the geographic distribution of projects and funds*, selecting technically sound projects across the basin at both a geographic and institutional level to achieve a reasonable balance of funding by Lake, applicant type, and the State of project location. Each Initial Proposal is reviewed from a holistic perspective, consequently, not every criteria needs to be present for a project to be selected. However, projects that meet more than one criteria will have a greater chance for success.

Specific and General Criteria will be applied in an extensive review process:

- GLNPO will screen Initial Proposals upon receipt for eligibility, conformance to the solicitation, and placement in categories which will afford them the greatest opportunity for success. Although GLNPO will attempt to discuss any such changes with Applicants in advance, GLNPO is not required to do so.
- At least three USEPA reviewers will evaluate each Initial Proposal.
- Evaluations will be discussed by USEPA technical review teams for each subject area. The review teams will identify an initial group of well-qualified Initial Proposals.
- Other USEPA and governmental reviewers, including State agencies, may conduct an additional review, and be given the opportunity to provide recommendations regarding any of the Initial Proposals, not just those identified as well-qualified.
- The USEPA review teams for each subject area will receive those reviews, meet and discuss them, develop final recommendations, and discuss those recommendations with management.
- Management will make selections. USEPA will invite only Applicants whose Initial Proposals are selected to submit detailed final Proposals along with the SF-424 and attendant documentation for Federal assistance (Application Packages).

Schedule.

Conference Call(s) for Public Questions*	Proposed for February and/or March
Deadline for Submission of Initial Proposals	8:00 AM Central Time, Monday morning, March 29
Initial Proposal Reviews (internal and external)	May 29
Applicants Notified	June 4
Application Packages due	through July 15
Final Decisions/Awards	June-September 30

* Because staff providing detailed pre-application assistance one-on-one such as to clarify criteria would not be allowed to be reviewers, GLNPO proposes to host 1-2 public conference calls during which applicants can ask any questions about the Funding Guidance. See

<http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/2004guid/index.html> and Section VII for more information.

VI. Award Administration

Notification: We will confirm Initial Proposal receipt within: (i) one week for E-Mail submissions or (ii) two weeks for regular mail. Shortly after the deadline, we will post Initial Proposal information (including Applicant, Title, and GLNPO identification number) at: <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/qlf.html>. ALL APPLICANTS SHOULD CHECK THIS POSTING TO VERIFY THAT THEIR INITIAL PROPOSALS HAVE BEEN INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSAL DATABASE. Contact brail.lawrence@epa.gov if you do not receive a confirmation or if your Initial Proposal is not posted. GLNPO will contact all Applicants to tell them whether or not they will be asked to submit Application Packages.

Issuance of Awards. USEPA reserves the right to negotiate changes in Initial Proposals before making final decisions and awards and reserves the right to reject all Initial Proposals or applications and make no awards. USEPA has 60 days to issue an award following receipt of the complete, fundable Application Package. Final funding decisions are based upon the Application Packages.

Administrative and Reporting Requirements applicable to Awards. The successful applicant will be required to adhere to the Federal grants requirements, particularly those found in applicable OMB circulars on Cost Principles (A-21, A-87, or A-122), Administrative Requirements (A-102 or 110), and Audit Requirements (A-133) available from <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants/>>. This includes government-wide requirements pertaining to accounting standards, lobbying, minority or woman business enterprise, publication, meetings, construction, and disposition of property. EPA regulations governing assistance programs and recipients are codified in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Those requirements, GLNPO-specific requirements, and the application materials that will be needed by applicants ultimately selected in this process can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/grtlakes/fund/projreqs.html> and <http://www.epa.gov/grtlakes/fund/appforms.html>

Grants Servicing Intermediary. GLNPO will select the successful Ecological Protection and Restoration and Invasive Species projects; however, most of these projects are expected to be issued and administered as sub-grants through an award to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Ecological Protection and Restoration, Invasive Species, and other grants may be issued as sub-awards through a Cooperative Agreement with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF). NFWF is the intermediary organization selected by GLNPO in 2003 to make and administer grant sub-awards to eligible organizations (same as above) engaged in ecological protection and restoration activities. Sub-awards administered by NFWF may support investigations, experiments, surveys, studies, training, research, and demonstrations (as allowed by Section 104(b)(3) of the Clean Water Act) to work towards the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes basin ecosystem.

Dispute Resolution Process. If necessary, a dispute resolution process in accordance with 40 CFR 30.63 and Part 31, subpart F will be implemented.

VII. Agency Contact(s)

Contacts are identified in Section I for each funding category. According to USEPA's [Competition Policy](#) and USEPA guidance, contacts may provide pre-application assistance to help potential applicants determine whether the applicant itself or the applicant's proposed project is eligible for funding, and whether an applicant or proposed activity is eligible for funding on the basis of the Funding Guidance criteria.

Unless they were to recuse themselves from the review process, contacts **may not** respond to requests for clarification of the Funding Guidance criteria unless that clarification is made available to all applicants. In order to still provide helpful advice, GLNPO proposes to schedule 1 or 2 public Conference Calls at which any Funding Guidance question may be publicly asked and answered. Applicants interested in participating in a Conference Call will need to register in advance. Conference Call details will be posted to <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/2004guid/index.html>

General Contact: Michael Russ (312-886-4013) / russ.michael@epa.gov
Technical Difficulties: Tony Kizlauskas (312- 353-8773 / kizlauskas.anthony) or
Pranas Prankevicius (312-353-3437 / prankevicius.pranas@epa.gov)

VIII. Other Information

About GLNPO. USEPA's Great Lakes National Program Office brings together Federal, state, tribal, local, and industry partners in an integrated, ecosystem approach to protect, maintain, and restore the chemical, biological, and physical integrity of the Great Lakes. The program monitors Lake ecosystem indicators; manages and provides public access to Great Lakes data; helps communities address contaminated sediments in their harbors; supports local protection and restoration of important habitats; promotes pollution prevention through activities and projects such as the Canada-U.S. Binational Toxics Strategy (GLBTS); explores emerging or strategic Great Lakes issues; and provides assistance for development and implementation of Lakewide Management Plans (LaMPs) and of community-based Remedial Action Plans (RAPs) for Areas of Concern. GLNPO has a staff of about 52 located in Chicago, Illinois, and an annual budget of about \$17 million. The 780 GLNPO projects totaling \$70 million funded between 1993 and 2003 are summarized at <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/fund/>.

Development of this Funding Guidance. The work, strategic thinking, and relationships with partners in the **2002 Great Lakes Strategy** and the **Lakewide Management Plans** were used to help formulate priorities and criteria for this Funding Guidance. The Strategy was developed cooperatively by the Federal, State, and Tribal members of the U.S. Policy Committee, with the consultation of the Great Lakes public. It describes objectives, measures, and activities by State, Tribal, and Federal partners working together to protect and restore the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Great Lakes Basin ecosystem. See: <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/gls/index.html> **Management Plans** for each of the Great Lakes have been developed and are updated biennially in cooperation with Federal, State, Tribal, and local partners. Each Lake plan is a plan of action to assess, restore, protect and monitor the ecosystem health of a Great Lake. It is used to coordinate the work of all the government, tribal, and non-government partners working to improve the Lake ecosystem. Specific project priorities of the LaMPs are included in this Funding Guidance. The

LaMPs can be found at <http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/gl2000/lamps/index.html> General funding priorities and targets were derived from the USEPA' budget submitted to Congress for approval, but not yet finalized. Development of that budget began in 2002. GLNPO seeks to maximize funding available for Great Lakes projects; consequently, funding will be derived from whatever source may become available during the year.

Other Funding Opportunities. When GLNPO is aware of appropriate funding opportunities in other USEPA offices, Initial Proposals will be forwarded to those offices for their consideration.